

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, and 23 are independent. Claim 23 is hereby amended. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements 35 U.S.C. §112. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the specification. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicants are entitled.

Claims 1 and 11 are amended herein, rendering the objection to the previous amendment moot.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 23, which was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, has been amended herein, obviating the rejection.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 6, 11-13, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein, et al (hereinafter, merely “Schein”).

IV. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3, 8-10, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al. in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0014753 to Beach et al.

Claims 4 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,966,637 to Kanungo et al.

Claims 5 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,404,507 to Bohm et al.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al. in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0014753 to Beach et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,039 to Livowsky et al.

Claims 15 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,039 to Livowsky et al.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,428 to Lee et al.

Claims 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al.

V. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“...accessing a dictionary database based on an input retrieval keyword;
extracting a plurality of additional keywords from a dictionary database as a function of the input retrieval keyword,
wherein each of the plurality of additional keywords are related to the input retrieval keyword;
accessing an electronic-program-guide database that stores electronic-program-guide data, as a function of the first keyword and a plurality of additional keywords ; and
downloading only electronic-program-guide data based on the extracted relevant-keyword information from the electronic-program-guide data stored in said electronic-program-guide database and the input retrieval keyword.”
(Emphasis Added)

As understood by Applicants, Schein relates to a method and apparatus for searching a guide and using a user's input of desired program characteristics to identify particular programs that may be of interest to the user. A user answers questions that aid identifying desired characteristics of a favorite program and then uses those responses to find other programs that may be of interest. Additionally, when a user is watching a program, the apparatus stores additional programs that may be of interest to the user based upon the program being watched.

Furthermore, Applicants note that the Office Action relies upon the same feature of Schein to disclose two features, specifically column 13, lines 33-43. Although the Office Action cites the feature in Schein as two overlapping disclosure, Applicants submit that only one feature is disclosed in column 13, 33-43.

Applicants respectfully submit that the same feature in Schein does not disclose both, "accessing a dictionary database based on an input retrieval keyword" and "extracting a plurality of additional keywords from a dictionary database as a function of the input retrieval keyword", as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, column 13, lines 33-39 of Schein discloses "after the user has entered a predetermined number of characters (for example, three) the system provides the user with a list of all the information within the database meeting the given criteria. For example, if the user selected MOVIES and entered "DR." the system might provide a list which includes "Dr. Doolittle," "Dr. Zhivago," "Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde," and "Dr. Strangelove." If the user then selected "Dr. Strangelove" the system would search the program guide to see if the desired movie was to be presented in the near future. The system can also be configured to continually search the program guide as it is updated, notifying the user when the desired program has been located."

Applicants submit that such a disclosure does not disclose any of the above-identified features of claim 1 and therefore does not render claim 1 unpatentable. Furthermore, the cited portion has no relevance to the present application.

Applicants submit that nothing has been found in Schein that discloses or suggests the above-identified features of independent claim 1. Specifically, Schein does not teach or suggest accessing a dictionary database based on an input retrieval keyword, extracting a

plurality of additional keywords from a dictionary database as a function of the input retrieval keyword, wherein each of the plurality of additional keywords are relevant to the input retrieval keyword, accessing an electronic-program-guide database that stores electronic-program-guide data, as a function of the first keyword and a plurality of additional keywords, and downloading only electronic-program-guide data based on the extracted relevant-keyword information from the electronic-program-guide data stored in said electronic-program-guide database and the input retrieval keyword, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above, amended independent claim 11 is patentable.

Claim 23 recites, *inter alia*:

“...wherein when retrieval keyword is input, and relevant-keyword information relevant to the retrieval keyword input by said client is extracted from said dictionary database provided at the client side, said client sends the relevant-keyword to said routing server and accesses one of the databases of said data server via said routing server storing information on routes to the parts of said data server, and said routing server accesses the database by selecting the route to the database so that retrieval by accessing the program information is performed based on the extracted relevant-keyword information and the input retrieval keyword...”

Furthermore, Applicants note that the Office Action again relies upon the same feature of Schein to disclose two features, specifically column 13, lines 33-43. Although the Office Action cites the feature in Schein as two overlapping disclosure, Applicants submit that only one feature is disclosed in column 13, 33-43.

Applicants submit that none of the art made of record discloses the above-identified features of claim 23. Therefore, claim 23 is patentable.

As understood by Applicants, the other art made of record does not add any disclosure that would render claim 1 or 11 unpatentable.

VI. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate the portion, or portions, of the reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
William S. Frommer
Reg. No. 25,505
(212) 588-0800